21/1/99

Transmittal Note

SUPPLEMENT TO

ANNEX 8 — AIRWORTHINESS OF AIRCRAFT

(Eighth Edition)

1. The attached Supplement supersedes all previous Supplements to Annex 8 and includes differences to the Annex notified by Contracting States before 21 January 1999.

2. This Supplement should be inserted at the end of Annex 8 (Eighth Edition). Additional differences received from Contracting States will be issued at intervals as amendments to this Supplement.

SUPPLEMENT TO ANNEX 8 — EIGHTH EDITION

AIRWORTHINESS OF AIRCRAFT

Differences between the national regulations and practices of Contracting States and the corresponding International Standards contained in Annex 8, as notified to ICAO in accordance with Article 38 of the *Convention on International Civil Aviation* and the Council's resolution of 21 November 1950.

JANUARY 1999

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

RECORD OF AMENDMENTS

No.	*Date*	*Entered by*	*No.*	*Date*	*Entered by*

AMENDMENTS TO ANNEX 8 ADOPTED OR APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL SUBSEQUENT TO THE EIGHTH EDITION ISSUED IN JULY 1988

No.	*Date of adoption or approval*	*Date applicable*	*No.*	*Date of adoption or approval*	*Date applicable*
96	22/3/94	10/11/94			
97	12/3/97	6/11/97; 12/3/2000			

1. Contracting States which have notified ICAO of differences

The Contracting States listed below have notified ICAO of differences which exist between their national regulations and practices and the International Standards of Annex 8 (Eighth Edition), or have commented on implementation.

The page numbers shown for each State and the dates of publication of those pages correspond to the actual pages in this Supplement.

State	*Date of Notification*	*Pages in Supplement*	*Date of publication*
Azerbaijan	31/7/97	1	21/1/99
Belize	30/6/97	1	21/1/99
Bhutan	21/8/98	1	21/1/99
Botswana	30/4/97	1	21/1/99
Cyprus	28/11/97	1	21/1/99
Ethiopia	4/3/97	1	21/1/99
Georgia	28/8/98	1	21/1/99
Ghana	7/5/97	1	21/1/99
Jamaica	18/8/97	1	21/1/99
Japan	9/10/97	1-2	21/1/99
Lebanon	12/11/97	1	21/1/99
Lithuania	18/8/97	1	21/1/99
Niger	1/5/98	1	21/1/99
Norway	11/7/97	1	21/1/99
Oman	6/3/98	1	21/1/99
Paraguay	11/6/98	1	21/1/99
Romania	23/10/98	1	21/1/99
Slovakia	8/8/97	1	21/1/99
South Africa	1/9/98	1	21/1/99
Spain	24/12/98	1	21/1/99
Suriname	17/4/97	1	21/1/99
Sweden	8/7/97	1	21/1/99
Uganda	25/2/97	1	21/1/99
United Kingdom	23/10/97	1	21/1/99
United Republic of Tanzania	26/1/98	1	21/1/99
United States	21/10/97	1-2	21/1/99

2. Contracting States which have notified ICAO that no differences exist

State	*Date of Notification*	*State*	*Date of notification*
Argentina	2/10/97	Germany	12/9/97
Australia	10/3/98	Ireland	8/2/98
Barbados	3/9/97	Monaco	18/6/97
Cameroon	15/9/97	Namibia	22/7/97
Canada	30/9/97	Netherlands	6/3/98
Chile	4/7/97	Russian Federation	1/10/97
Cuba	11/7/97	Saudi Arabia	7/7/97
Finland	10/9/97	Tunisia	16/8/97

3. Contracting States from which no information has been received

Afghanistan
Albania
Algeria
Angola
Antigua and Barbuda
Armenia
Austria
Bahamas
Bahrain
Bangladesh
Belarus
Belgium
Benin
Bolivia
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Brazil
Brunei Darussalam
Bulgaria
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cambodia
Cape Verde
Central African Republic
Chad
China
Colombia
Comoros
Congo
Cook Islands
Costa Rica
Côte d'Ivoire
Croatia
Czech Republic
Democratic People's Republic of Korea
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Denmark
Djibouti
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
El Salvador
Equatorial Guinea
Eritrea
Estonia
Fiji
France
Gabon
Gambia
Greece
Grenada
Guatemala
Guinea
Guinea-Bissau
Guyana
Haiti
Honduras
Hungary
Iceland
India
Indonesia
Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Iraq
Israel
Italy
Jordan
Kazakhstan
Kenya
Kiribati
Kuwait
Kyrgyzstan
Lao People's Democratic Republic
Latvia
Lesotho
Liberia
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
Luxembourg
Madagascar
Malawi
Malaysia
Maldives
Mali
Malta
Marshall Islands
Mauritania
Mauritius
Mexico
Micronesia (Federated States of)
Mongolia
Morocco
Mozambique
Myanmar
Nauru
Nepal
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Nigeria
Pakistan
Palau
Panama
Papua New Guinea
Peru
Philippines
Poland
Portugal
Qatar
Republic of Korea
Republic of Moldova
Rwanda
Saint Lucia
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Samoa
San Marino
Sao Tome and Principe
Senegal
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Singapore
Slovenia
Solomon Islands
Somalia
Sri Lanka
Sudan
Swaziland
Switzerland
Syrian Arab Republic
Tajikistan
Thailand
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Togo
Tonga
Trinidad and Tobago
Turkey
Turkmenistan
Ukraine
United Arab Emirates
Uruguay
Uzbekistan
Vanuatu
Venezuela
Viet Nam
Yemen
Zambia
Zimbabwe

4. Paragraphs with respect to which differences have been notified

Paragraph	*Differences notified by*
General	Japan
	South Africa
PART I	
Definitions	Japan
	United States
PART II	
2.2	Azerbaijan
	Belize
	Bhutan
	Botswana
	Cyprus
	Ethiopia
	Georgia
	Ghana
	Lebanon
	Lithuania
	Niger
	Paraguay
	Romania
	Slovakia
	Suriname
	Uganda
3.1	Azerbaijan
	Belize
3.2	Azerbaijan
	Belize
4.1	Azerbaijan
	Belize
	Niger
4.2.2	United Kingdom
4.2.3	Azerbaijan
	Cyprus
	Niger
	United States
4.2.4	South Africa
	United Kingdom
4.2.5	Bhutan
	Oman
	South Africa
	United Republic of Tanzania
4.2.6	United Kingdom
4.2.7	United Kingdom
	United States
4.2.8	South Africa
	United Kingdom
	United Republic of Tanzania
4.2.9	United Kingdom
5.1	Ghana
6.2.1	United Republic of Tanzania
6.2.2	Azerbaijan
7	Bhutan
	Botswana
	Ghana
	South Africa
8	Jamaica
PART III	
Chapter 1	
1.1.3	United States
1.5.1	United States
Chapter 2	
2.2.3	United States
Chapter 4	
4.1.6 b)	Spain
4.1.6 g)	Japan
	Norway
	Sweden
4.1.6 h)	Japan
	Norway
	Spain
	Sweden
4.1.6 i)	Norway
	Sweden
Chapter 9	
9.3.5	Japan
	United Kingdom
9.5	Jamaica

Paragraph	*Differences notified by*
Chapter 10	
10.1	Ghana
Chapter 11	Norway
	Sweden
11.1	Japan
	Spain
11.2	Japan
	Spain
11.3	Japan
	Spain
PART IV	
Chapter 1	
1.2, Note 1	United States
Chapter 2	
2.2.1	Japan
	United States
2.2.2	Japan
	United States
2.2.3.1	Japan
	United States
2.2.3.1.1	Japan
	United States
2.2.3.1.2	Japan
	United States
2.2.3.1.3	Japan
	United States
2.2.3.1.4	Japan
	United States
2.2.3.2	Japan
	United States
2.2.3.3	Japan
2.2.3.3.1	Japan
	United States
Chapter 4	
4.1.6 e)	United States
Chapter 6	
6.3.2	Japan
Chapter 7	
7.4.2	United States

PART II

2.2	A comprehensive and detailed national airworthiness code is not implemented.
3.1	The issuance of a certificate of airworthiness is not implemented.
3.2	Rendering valid the original certificate of airworthiness is not implemented.
4.1	The determination of the continuing airworthiness of an aircraft is not implemented.
4.2.3	Mandatory continuing airworthiness information is not implemented.
6.2.2	The determination of the airworthiness of an aircraft that has sustained damage is not implemented.

PART II

2.2 A national code of airworthiness is not implemented.

3.1 Proof of compliance with appropriate airworthiness requirements is not implemented.

3.2 Proof of compliance with appropriate airworthiness requirements is not implemented.

4.1 The determination of the continuing airworthiness of aircraft is not implemented.

PART II

2.2	A national code of airworthiness is not implemented.
4.2.5	There is no system for reporting faults, malfunctions and defects.
7	There is no standard form of Certificate of Airworthiness.

PART II

2.2	A comprehensive and detailed national airworthiness code is not implemented.
7	Provisions concerning the information to be contained in the certificate of airworthiness are only partially implemented.

PART II

2.2 A comprehensive and detailed national airworthiness code is not implemented.

4.2.3 Mandatory continuing airworthiness information is not implemented.

PART II

2.2 A national code of airworthiness is not implemented.

PART II

2.2 A national airworthiness code is not implemented.

PART II

2.2 A national airworthiness code is not implemented.

5.1 Not implemented.

7 Not implemented.

PART III

Chapter 10

10.1 Ghana has no provisions concerning maintenance information.

PART II

8 Aircraft flight manuals regarding aircraft limitations are not implemented.

PART III

Chapter 9

9.5 Aeroplane flight manuals are not implemented.

General Japanese airworthiness requirements are basically equivalent to those stipulated in the United States Federal Aviation Regulations. Furthermore, the schedule for the full implementation of all the provisions of Annex 8, up to and including Amendment 97, has not been determined yet.

PART I

Definitions *Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters.* Large helicopters (heavier than 2 730 kg) are classified as either Category TA or TB on the basis of weight and performance capabilities. There is no classification scheme for all other helicopters (2 730 kg or less).

PART III

Chapter 4

4.1.6 g) Fire suppression systems do not take into account fires caused by explosive or incendiary devices.

4.1.6 h) Design precautions are taken to protect against cabin depressurization and against the presence of smoke and toxic gases, except those caused by explosive or incendiary devices.

Chapter 9

9.3.5 Identification of a least-risk bomb location is not required.

Chapter 11

11.1 Japan has no requirement for the provision of a least-risk bomb location.

11.2 Japan has no such requirement.

11.3 Japan has no such requirement.

PART IV

Chapter 2

2.2.1 As stated in the difference with respect to the definitions of classes of helicopters in Part I, classifications in our country are based on weight as well as performance.

2.2.2 As stated in the difference with respect to the definitions of classes of helicopters in Part I, classifications in our country are based on weight as well as performance.

2.2.3.1
2.2.3.1.1
2.2.3.1.2
2.2.3.1.3
2.2.3.1.4 For Category TB helicopters, only take-off distance is required to be included in the performance data while take-off distance, path and rejected take-off distance information is required for Category TA helicopters. There are no comparable requirements for helicopters weighing less than 2 730 kg.

2.2.3.2 En-route performance is based solely on climb performance for both all-engines operating and one engine inoperative situations (Category TA/TB). There are no comparable requirements for helicopters weighing less than 2 730 kg.

2.2.3.3 The landing decision point (LDP) is required for Category TA helicopters only.

2.2.3.3.1 The landing decision point (LDP) is required for Category TA helicopters only.

Chapter 6

6.3.2 Installation of rotor overspeed warnings is not required with respect to any category of helicopters.

PART II

2.2 A detailed code of airworthiness is not implemented.

PART II

2.2 A national airworthiness code is not implemented.

PART II

2.2 A national code of airworthiness is not implemented.

4.1 Provisions concerning the determination of the continuing airworthiness of aircraft are not implemented.

4.2.3 Mandatory continuing airworthiness information is not implemented.

PART III

Chapter 4

4.1.6 g), h) and i) JAR 25 is the adopted airworthiness code in Norway. Norway participates in JAA working groups and will adopt changes to this code when properly agreed.

Chapter 11 JAR 25 is the adopted airworthiness code in Norway. Norway participates in JAA working groups and will adopt changes to this code when properly agreed.

PART II

4.2.5 There are no provisions for the transmission of information regarding faults, malfunctions and defects to the organization responsible for the type design.

PART II

2.2 A national airworthiness code has not been fully implemented.

PART II

2.2 A national airworthiness code is not implemented.

PART II

2.2 A national airworthiness code is not implemented.

PART II

4.2.4	There are no provisions concerning the transmission to the State of Design of all mandatory continuing airworthiness information.
4.2.5	There are no provisions concerning the transmission of information on malfunctions and defects to the organization responsible for type design.
4.2.8	There are no provisions concerning the type of service information to be reported.
7	There is no standard form of Certificate of Airworthiness.

PART III

Chapter 4

4.1.6 b)	Spanish regulations read “critical aeroplane systems required for flight”.
4.1.6 h)	This paragraph is superfluous since the effect of decompression is dealt with elsewhere, irrespective of the possible cause.

Chapter 11

11.1	Spain has no plans to incorporate provisions concerning the identification of a least-risk bomb location.
11.2	Spain has no plans to incorporate security-related provisions concerning weapons and explosives.
11.3	Spain has no plans to incorporate security-related provisions concerning weapons and explosives

PART II

2.2 A national code of airworthiness is not implemented.

PART III

Chapter 4

4.1.6 g), h) and i) JAR 25 is the adopted airworthiness code in Sweden. Sweden participates in JAA working groups and will adopt changes to this code when properly agreed.

Chapter 11 JAR 25 is the adopted airworthiness code in Sweden. Sweden participates in JAA working groups and will adopt changes to this code when properly agreed.

PART II

2.2 A national code of airworthiness is not implemented.

PART II

4.2.2 British Civil Aviation Regulations (BCARs) do not make a clear distinction between the State of Design and the State of Manufacture.

4.2.4 Mandatory information is contained in CAA documents CAP 473 and CAP 474. These are distributed to States upon request. Since our distribution is not automatic, we do not therefore ensure transmission to the State of Design. In practice we do distribute to many States.

4.2.6 British Civil Aviation Regulations (BCARs) do not make a clear distinction between the State of Design and the State of Manufacture.

4.2.7 British Civil Aviation Regulations (BCARs) do not make a clear distinction between the State of Design and the State of Manufacture.

4.2.8 British Civil Aviation Regulations (BCARs) do not make a clear distinction between the State of Design and the State of Manufacture.

4.2.9 British Civil Aviation Regulations (BCARs) do not make a clear distinction between the State of Design and the State of Manufacture.

PART III

Chapter 9

9.3.5 A least-risk bomb location on the aeroplane is not required to be identified.

PART II

4.2.5 In practice Tanzania requires mandatory reporting of faults, malfunctions, defects and other occurrences which cause or might cause adverse effects on continuing airworthiness for all aircraft irrespective of their maximum certificated take-off mass.

4.2.8 In practice Tanzania requires mandatory reporting of faults, malfunctions, defects and other occurrences which cause or might cause adverse effects on continuing airworthiness for all aircraft irrespective of their maximum certificated take-off mass.

6.2.1 No regulation is in place empowering the Authority to prevent an aircraft from resuming flight in cases of damage affecting its airworthiness. In practice, the Authority informs the State of Registry in such circumstances and relies on the operator to adhere to the regulations and practices of the State of Registry.

PART I

Definitions

Performance Class 1, 2 and 3 helicopters. Large helicopters (heavier than 6 000 lb) are classified as either Category A or B on the basis of weight, passenger-carrying capacity and auxiliary systems as well as performance capabilities. There is no classification scheme for all other helicopters (6 000 lb or less).

Standard atmosphere. The United States uses the U.S. Standard Atmosphere, 1962. This standard contains a sea-level molecular weight (M_0) of 28.9644 kg $(kg\text{-}mol)^{-1}$.

PART II

4.2.3 The United States does not generally issue Airworthiness Directives for non-type certificated aircraft. This includes foreign aircraft that are U.S.-registered, but operate under experimental rather than standard airworthiness certificates.

4.2.7 At this time, the United States does not require the continuing structural integrity programme to contain specific information concerning corrosion prevention and control.

Remark: The FAA expects to have regulations in effect that will assure compliance by December 1998. In the interim, the FAA will issue mandatory airworthiness information (airworthiness directives) to mandate such programmes as necessary.

PART III

Chapter 1

1.1.3 Effective 17 October 1979, the United States certificated certain aeroplanes at weights in excess of 5 700 kg (12 566 lb) that do not fully meet the ICAO Airworthiness Standards of Part III. The Airworthiness Certificate of aeroplanes that do not meet ICAO Standards will be endorsed as follows:

"This aeroplane at weights in excess of 5 700 kg does not meet the airworthiness requirements of ICAO, as prescribed by Annex 8 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation."

1.5.1 The United States also uses service experience and equivalent safety findings as a basis for finding compliance with the appropriate airworthiness requirements.

Chapter 2

2.2.3 This ICAO provision requires performance data to be scheduled for ranges of gradient of the landing surface for landplanes and ranges of water surface conditions, water density and current strength for seaplanes. For landplanes, the United States requires the landing distance to be determined only on a level runway. For seaplanes, the United States requires the landing distance on water to be determined only on smooth water. Operational take-off and landing distance margins are applied where appropriate by United States operational regulations and guidance.

PART IV

Chapter 1

1.2, Note 1 The United States does not allow the weight and centre of gravity limitations to vary as a function of altitude or phase of flight (take-off, cruise, landing, etc.).

Chapter 2

2.2.1 As stated in the difference with respect to the definitions of classes of helicopters in Part I, United States classifications are based on other factors as well as performance.

2.2.2 As stated in the difference with respect to the definitions of classes of helicopters in Part I, United States classifications are based on other factors as well as performance.

2.2.3.1
2.2.3.1.1
2.2.3.1.2
2.2.3.1.3
2.2.3.1.4 For Category B helicopters, only take-off distance is required to be included in the performance data while take-off distance, path and rejected take-off distance information is required for Category A helicopters. There are no comparable requirements for helicopters weighing less than 6 000 pounds.

2.2.3.2 En-route performance is based solely on climb performance for both all-engines operating and one engine inoperative situations (Categories A and B). There is no comparable requirement for helicopters weighing less than 6 000 pounds.

2.2.3.3.1 The landing decision point (LDP) is required for Category A helicopters only.

Chapter 4

4.1.6 e) The United States does not provide criteria relative to the fire protection/prevention for interior furnishing materials replaced during major refurbishment. The fire protection levied is dependent on the original certification basis.

Chapter 7

7.4.2 Minimum acceptable intensities are prescribed for navigation lights and anti-collision lights, i.e. no reduction below these levels is possible.